



*"Man is the measure-  
ment of everything."*

If There Is Anything That Cannot Bear Free Thought--Let It Crack--WENDELL PHILLIPS

Vol. 7--No. 2

Administration and Editorial Address  
P. O. Box 971, Los Angeles, Calif.

Los Angeles, Calif., February, 1939

1 (465)

Single Copy 5 Cents

## TRAGIC END OF THE HEROIC SPANISH STRUGGLE

The almost sudden fall of Barcelona into the hands of the fascist mercenaries came about after thirty months of war in Spain. This was followed by the collapse of the entire defence of Catalonia, the fleeing of the Loyalist Government from one place to another, ending in its imploring of the two chief Government Judases—England and France—to arrange some sort of a peace with Franco and Company.

At this time it is scarcely possible to draw definite conclusions as to what brought about this sudden collapse. Even the pro-loyalist correspondent of the N. Y. "TIMES," Mr. Mathews, expressed his utter surprise at the failure of the central armies from the Madrid area to come to the Rescue of Catalonia—although this aid was heralded by the Loyalist Government. (The reader is asked to recall that Madrid was in even a more precarious situation than Catalonia, and at that time it was Catalonia that came to the rescue and saving of Madrid.) It would therefore not surprise anyone to learn that the collapse of Catalonia was like the fall of so many other strategic centers in the Spanish war, a complete sell-out.

No one can deny any longer that a catastrophe has now befallen the heroic fighting people of Spain.

No sooner had the sell-out of Czechoslovakia become known than news began to trickle through to the effect that the "democratic" Chamberlain and Daladier were selling out Spain to the fascist mercenaries. No one knew this better than the Loyalist Government of Spain. Still, the same Loyalist Government continued to carry on its suicidal policy of trying to please the charlatans of the democracies.

While the infamous "Non Intervention Committee" definitely carried on its work to aid the fascist designs of Italy and Germany—through Franco, the Loyalist Government was busily engaged in bringing about the destruction of the collectives—the sole revolutionary achievements for which the people of Spain considered it worth while to fight and die. All this was done as a means of pleasing and proving to the democracies of the world that capitalism still has a chance to thrive in Spain. Such was the policy ordained by the agents of Bolshevik Russia. To our great shame, too, we must admit that our comrades of the F.A.I.—through the C.N.T.—agreed to this suicidal anti-fascist front policy.

To come back to the infamous "Non Intervention Committee," we must remember that the arch-hypocrite Chamberlain tried to convey the impression that the "work" of the committee was a "success." Indeed, it was a success—for the interests of the fascists. Who else could have derived benefit from such a committee? The fact that the representative of marxian-ruled Russia agreed to its formation and participated in its misdeeds—as did the Socialist Premier Leon Blum—does not change the fact that the oppressed of the world can place no trust in socialists or communists once they assume the role of governmental functionaries.

The role played by our own democracy in helping to carry out the fascist "victory" over the people of Spain and, consequently, the abrogation of any freedom which the fighting people of Spain might have attained—is more than damnable. Only the blind worshipers of the leader of the United States Government can forget and excuse the hypocritical role played by President Roosevelt. He was one of the first to join in the suppression of the aspirations of the people of Spain; he was one of the first to employ the embargo—a weapon never intended for a situation wherein a "lawfully constituted" government is denied the right to purchase arms. And it is no longer a secret that the Roman papacy as well as British and French powers "persuaded" him to these acts. A free Spain, economically and politically speaking, is the last thing which "liberal" Roosevelt—no less so than the Chamberlains, Blums, Edens and Daladiers—would have wished to see.

\* \* \*

We have pointed out the treacherous role of the democrats, socialists and communists toward the people of Spain. However, we feel we must differentiate

between the above named brands of rulers. The treachery employed by the democracies is understandable. Nothing else could have been expected of them. Any government claiming to adhere to the retention of the capitalist system should be expected to commit treacheries such as those we have been witnessing. In fact, we know of no democracy which would not resort to fascism if that would be the only recourse left open as a safeguard for the capitalist system.

However, when a Marxian "revolutionary" Government and a Socialist Coalition Government enact a role similar to that played by the democracies, then they are committing the rankest sort of treachery toward the oppressed of the world. We must bear in mind, too, that both socialists and communists claim to be the vanguards of the oppressed in their struggle for emancipation.

This is the great lesson to be learned from the tragical end of the struggle in Spain

At the very outset of the struggle in Spain there was the chance of its assuming the aspect and signi-

ficance of the Russian October revolution. As the struggle went on—the compromises enacted by the Loyalist Government increased—condoned in by the revolutionary forces that should have known better. The effects of this disastrous course upon the struggle within Spain as well as in diminishing a solidaric response by the oppressed of the world—as was witnessed against the intervention of the allied troops upon revolutionary Russia—contributed most to the catastrophic end.

## The Ancient and Modern Fascist Doctrine

By Gonzalo DE REPARAZ

Fascism is a resurrection and cannot be new. It reproduces, creates nothing. The first mediterranean civilization, Bereber, flowered simultaneously in Andalusia and in Creta. Humanity finds itself at the dawn of navigation when the use of metals began. Through the Cretene ruins, recently discovered, we began to know the unknown chapter of our racial infancy. We were still at the Bronze Age when the first people arrived from Central Asia with the Greeks at their vanguard. They won and destroyed the Cretene civilization for they were ahead of us. They used iron from which they made better arms than those made from Bronze, the only ones that the Cretene and Iberians knew then. We were saved from the conquest by distance. The invaders were shepherds-seminomads, who suddenly changed their terrestrial nomadism for the sea; they followed the Cretene and competed with the Phoenicians.

They built nations of a unique architectural type, dividing the land amongst the conquerors, from the top to the bottom. The military caste was triumphant with the King at the head, the church and the people themselves—finally those who were forcibly captured robbed and enslaved. The master lived in a castle, at its feet were the plebian houses and at theirs the slaves' barracks. Since the nomads had no castles, neither had they a name for themselves nor for their chief, they took it from the Cretene. From them they derived, and not from the Greek or Latin, the words tower and tyrant, daughters of the Berger iterem (tyrant). From this disposed constitution the Greeks went further into the constitution of cities, divided also. But the Roman people reached to perfection by creating a strong State, centralized and dominant. They were very powerful indeed, until they finished the Mediterranean wealth, for it was exploited to its end by insatiable capitalism and in time decayed. Then the men came from the North, a sister race, but one that was still living in the wilderness and destroyed this urban civilization.

And now a fresh start has to be made. The vast cities disappeared, the fields were little by little re-peopled; the castles flowered once more with its villages at its feet, they formed a warring caste with a king at the head and war remained the principal industry.

This embryonic organism was moved by two new forces who gave it cohesion, but it wasn't essentially different from what it was in its prior life; Christianity and the State; one emanated from Semitism; the other from the Roman Corpse.

Christianism proclaimed the natural equality of men and denied the racism of great philosophers. It reached the Western world adulterated by the Helians. When St. Paul introduced Christianity to the Roman world, he opened thereby to the new faith a Greek road, he spoiled it by de-Semiteizing it. Then the Roman organization that was given by the Church made of it a social and political force, at the expenses of a moral and progressive force, while the Roman fascist idea, (Strong State) brought division of classes, military power, capitalist land ownership; brought life to a corpse ready to abandon its tomb. The Renaissance, powerful reactionary movement, re-

### World Governments Assassinate Spain



Pablo de Azcarate, Spanish loyalist Ambassador, protested to the Foreign office of England against the DE-LIBERATE silence of the non-intervention committee regarding the sale of six Italian warships to the Spanish insurgents.—UNITED PRESS DISPATCH, JAN. 19, 1939.

The Daladier-Bonnet combination will receive a vote of confidence when the French Parliament votes on the Cabinet decision to continue allowing the Italian and German dictatorship a free hand in destroying the Spanish Republic. By adhering to its policy of refusing to sell arms to the Spanish Republic, the United States gives valuable aid to Mussolini and Hitler. Historical responsibility for the suffocation of Spain, thus, for the third time, rests partly upon the American Administration and Congress. The first was when, at the beginning of the totalitarian attack through Franco, President Roosevelt adopted a policy of neutrality, meaning that it was depriving the Spanish Republic of its normal right to purchase war material. The second was last spring, when the Presidential desire to aid the Spanish Republic was prevented by the Anglo-French intimation that they hoped the U.S.A. would not move, and the administration's acceptance of this hint.

—Edgar Ansel Mowrer in the "CHICAGO DAILY NEWS" of Jan. 20, 1939.



# MODERN FASCISM IN PRACTICE—TODAY

Maurice Germain

(Franco's Murderers by an Eye-Witness)

The author of a series of articles published in the review "Timon", under the name of "Prometeo" is in Paris. I had quite a lengthy talk with him. Because some members of his family are still living under the fascist terror, it would not do to state his name.

—What happened in the North of Spain after the loss of Santander and Asturias?

—In Asturias alone forty thousand people were murdered by order of commander Doval.

—Is there still any resistance?

—Yes, there is still a fierce resistance on the part of the C. N. T. and F. A. I.; more than three thousand guerrilleros hold fast in the mountains called Los Picos de Europa, at the borders of Santander and Asturias. The Fascists don't care to try the least expedition in those regions. All encounters are merciless.

—How are they fed?

—When the situation became desperate these people moved to the mountains with their herds. They knew every deep gorge and ravine, and in spite of the harsh conditions they were able to hold out; the villages remained faithful to those who fight for the workers of Spain, even though they sometimes become the victims of such faithfulness.

—Besides the phalangists who are those who took part in the abominations you spoke of? Tell me what has been the doings of the clergy? Has the influence of the later not been exaggerated?

Our Comrade looked me straight in the eye. I felt that he was all upset. He made a bitter gesture and said:

—The true facts about the moral and direct participation of the clergy are not yet known. All monks and nuns have left the convents; they hide their tonsures and their shaved heads under the BOINAS; and men and women dressed in MONOS go among the "reds" with the phalangists in punitive expeditions. You want some facts, some details, here they are.

vivified it. Then came Charlemagne's Empire, the Roman Germanic, Charles V and Louis XIV and Napoleon's. The Universalization of History (Oceanic Age) by a material impulse (never cultural) created the British Empire, due to its power a truly continuator of the Roman Empire.

The wars between Empires mobilizes the masses, the age of gold favored Capitalist accumulation just as it did in Rome, where even great philosophers like Seneca were great exploiters of big business. It also ameliorates some of the sad lot of the proletariat. Now we arrive at the Industrial Age in which a new element plays its role. In the Roman Capitalist Era there was no other machine but human beings—the slaves. Now however there are other machines and to the proletariat energies, they added natural energies; coal, steam, electricity, etc. Nevertheless, distance is made shorter, the world becomes narrower; men have more intimate relations and a new revolutionary wave begins a la Roman dress in France and Gowsls (1789-93). The masses agitate, they are not pushed forward by classical ideology but by the powerful breath of Semite though Christianized society that refused to follow Jesus and now saw with that the soft and spiritual Jew, scorned by them has an authoritarian and materialist successor: Karl Marx. Also two great Slavs, Kropotkin and Bakunin. Here then was the reason for the furious anti-revolutionary movement by the European higher classes to be antisemite and further antislav. But remember also that the Roman plutocracy was a great enemy of Christ and was conquered by him.

Now philosophers of the new cycle come and follow those of the first cycle. Therefore the old civilization could not have a new culture. France, sorry for its revolutionary Romanism, which began Republican and ended Napoleonic had rectified and divined the Middle Age. Let us remember the Genius of Christianity. Chateaubriand, Learned Germans, scratching archiology and philology brought to light old forgotten races, sowing thus the seed of nationalism. It was not France that gave the tocsin revolutionary in 1848. It was Germanism, Italianism, Magiarism, Rumanianism and Slavism. And immediately after comes Gobineau with his book about the University of the Human Race (1854). By mixing the doctrine of the inequality of races with the restoration of oppressed nations, the result is a destructive explosion. First because nations and races do not coincide, and because the national racists forcibly want it to coincide, creating thousands of conflicts to achieve the coincidence, for example: Czechoslovakia.

2nd.—Because there is no such thing as specifically superior races, Humanity is not a divided thing of different species but is only one specie of infinite variety intermixed in mestizant contacts beginning from the most remote times of prehistory. And as the Apostles' doctrine want the rulerships of the world for the superior races, submitting the inferior races to slavery, or their extermination, here we find them a problem of constant war, and as a solution the extermination of one part of humanity.

And "Prometeo" gave me dactylographed notes. They read partially as follows:

**THEIR FEROCITY:** In the Sobrado village seven houses of "reds" were burned down to the ground. The Fascists murdered Gregorio Dinero, his three sons and servant, poured kerosene over his daughter and were going to burn her alive when she called a civil guard who stopped the crime. Monks and nuns always take the initiative as incendiaries and murderers. "Fascism," said they, "must triumph through terrorism, the elimination of all opponents and the rejection of all traces of sentiment."

The house of don Fidel, a rightist, was burned down because his son in law was a leftist republican, though he himself had three sons in Franco's army defending "God and the Country". The Fascists had first taken everything valuable. The authors of this robbery and incendiarism were two monks and four nuns, well known by the family and owner of the property. The same religious people had arrested twenty men and women who were set free by the civil guards, but murdered in the mountains after their liberation.

At Cobas, a small village near Cancellia, they killed our comrade widower Niceto and his six children. Upon entering one of the rooms where two sick children were in bed they lost their BOINAS, due to the low door frame; we then saw the nuns' shaved heads and the monks' tonsures. They compelled their victims to kiss the cross. Nine others were also murdered, among them Fermín.

At Pouferrada Dr. Julio Garzon, accused of being a leftist, was sentenced to death. They rang the church bell as for a fiesta and forced the population to witness the execution. Dr. Garzon, handcuffed, was presented to the public as a criminal. His wife was placed in the first row; the Plaza de la Constitucion was guarded by three hundred phalangists and civil guards.

The doctor was first beaten unconscious with the butt ends of guns. The impressing silence was suddenly broken by a terrible cry. The doctor's wife

Aristotle, Plato and comrade philosophers pronounced the solution of slavery but the contemporary philosophy of capitalism is much more radical than that. It aspires to mop up the planet.

The first sacrificed victim on the altar of racist religion will be the Jewish people. The unhappy Jew has money, but lacks an army to defend himself, and in our times of International banditry to have a full pocketbook and being insufficiently armed offers grave inconveniences. Such things took place in Rome in the last years of the last cycle of our civilization, when powerful piratical navies were the masters of the Mediterranean sea. To the social problem fascism applies the same racial principle. The government belongs to the better class of people; therefore, in the international aspect the direction of humanity's destiny will be in the hands of a superior race, and in the national aspect a group of supermen will be in charge of the government, the masses are helpless, that is why its government (democracy) is fatally in the hands of demagogues and falls in the hands of dictatorships. Thanks to such a doctrine, capitalism, upheld by militarism, its partner, is able to dominate and exploit all wealth. Clericalism helps it (by their participation in business) by promising the people a paradise in the other world. Christ offers the poor and persecuted a heaven after their death. The gravest thing for the Church is that Marx, Kropotkin and Bakunin demand those things now. So at least they will not be content in the present capitalist inferno. In conclusion, the struggle now is between patricians (the directing group) and plebians (the masses directed and exploited) for the conquest of the world by a superior race for the benefit of its patricians. The same as happened three thousand years ago. There are two Poles in this struggle. One is the Thames; the other is in the Ebro.

(Translated by Louis Raymond)

**Translators note:** The Jew is to-day — as in the past, the goat and the victim of arrogant barbarians. Centuries pass by, expire, and are destroyed. Tyrannical systems fall and new ones abound today dressed in different colors. The Jew is here again. Today going once more through a crucial reign of terror. The Jewish people can't be exterminated; their love for social justice is stronger than their inquisitors. Thousands of years ago the Jews were part of Germany, Rome and Spain and in spite of the two lunatics' efforts to destroy them the Jew may yet be the main cause of their destruction. And if the Spanish people with their unique culture and civilization are destroyed by the new weapon of capitalism, let us thank the masses of other lands who seemingly are asleep like constant asses; who could, and still can, stop their tragedy and yet dare not move.

Don't forget today the Ebro is betrayed and sold out by two great nations that tomorrow when fascism will be at Constantinople's gates will band together and fight it to the death to defend their privileges.

screamed and fainted. Both were revived. Again they were tortured: they forced splinters under the doctor's nails; he never uttered a word. His suffering contorted his body. He fainted. Brought to life again with vinegar he was stung all over the body, and where blood ran, vinegar was poured to increase his tortures. They stung him more and more until he dropped, not to rise again. When they saw that their efforts to revive him were in vain, they finished him with daggers and burned his body while his wife lay upon the ground unconscious. The public looked at each other in amazement and terror.

It is impossible to translate the whole manuscript as it would occupy too much space. The torments for men and women varied very little. Few died simply executed. However, let us try to sum up the unheard of amplexes of the crime erected in law and divine commandment:

At Villafranca del Berzo people were arrested without being questioned, in the night they were taken to the mountains where, after undergoing sadistic tortures, they were executed. The corpses remained for many days before being buried.

Camilo Meneses Diaz, secretary of the Labor Temple was tortured and executed. Joaquin Suarez Diaz, lawyer, was transferred to Leon and shot after unending torment. The reason given was that he had taken the defense of the Miners Syndicat of Fabero. His fifteen year old son was fighting among the phalangists. Salvador Alavarez, tubercular, was mutilated and executed. And likewise were executed after indescribable tortures: Antonio Sabrin, Bentemillas, Esteban and Jose Fernandez (father and son), and Narciso Janes.

In the little village of Corullon they found the mutilated corpses of sixteen railroad workers. In Hormiga the same abominations were perpetrated, Castro Petre, Toral de los Vados, Valtuille de Abajo and others were the martyrs.

But Pouferrada remains the center of crime. Most Arenas near the city have been the grounds of thousands of assassinations.

Women as well as men are victims of Fascists. Because some women had relatives in the republican ranks they were arrested, their heads shaved, save a queue to attach the royalist ruban, a cross was painted or burned upon their foreheads, and in night gowns they were paraded through the streets. The outrages these women went through cannot be described.

This long manuscript, this unmerciful requisitory will be published one day. The names and details will follow unending. The reading of it is loathsome. The truth of what is taking place under the Spanish Fascist regime appears naked. The murders estimated at more than a hundred and fifty thousand are largely exceeded. What is called the Spanish nationalist movement is nothing else than an Inquisition multiplied a hundred times, in which the religious organizations unite with the military to terrorize the Spanish masses who are the most revolutionary in the world, so as to stop them from ever raising their heads.

Are we going to let the men of Munich try to impose on Spain the dictates of gangsters in uniform and the rule of the inquisitors who carry the Christ cross with the butcher's knife?

(Translated by Jules Scarceriaux)

## "GOD" SAVE "OUR" COUNTRY...

NEW PHILADELPHIA, Ohio, Jan 10 (UP).—Thirteen-year-old Bobby Stewart and his buddy, Eddie Mizer, fifteen, furrowed their foreheads today and got to work on the book reviews Juvenile Judge J. H. Lamneck said they had to write because they printed "anarchist" literature on a toy printing press they got for Christmas.

"The books are hard, too," Bobby complained. They included a biography of Leon Czolgosz, assassin of President McKinley; a biography of Thomas Jefferson, "The Making of an American"; "The Citadel" and "Magnificent Obsession."

Judge Lamneck ordered each to read a book a month during a year of probation. Then he prescribed the books.

The boys had produced handbills reading "Join the anarchists now or be sorry," and "Hurrah for anarchy, down with taxes and crooked politics." Some had gone on store windows, others to residences.

Bobby and Eddie said it was "all in fun."

## MAN!

A monthly Journal of the Anarchist Ideal and Movement

MARCUS GRAHAM, Editor

Subscription Price: \$1.00 per year, Six months Fifty Cents.—Sample Copies Free Upon Request

MAN! invites the collaboration of all writers and artists who are in sympathy with our ideas to send us essays, poems, and drawings. No payment can be made. Where return of manuscript is desired sufficient postage should be included.

Administration and Editorial Address:

MAN!

P. O. Box 971 Los Angeles, Calif., U.S.A.



## Unknown Heroes of Anti-Militarism

Quite often we read of governments' celebrations in honour of "The Unknown Soldier" who has bravely died "for his country." In reality, however, he did not die willingly; he was forced to die in the interests of the State and Capitalism with their powerful arms and munitions industry and its profits. Ludicrously enough the heads of governments celebrate the death of these "unknown soldiers" whom they themselves have sent to death, "unknown soldiers" who slavishly submitted to the dictums of governmental and military force.

There are, however, other "unknown soldiers" who do not allow themselves to be coaxed into submission to governmental policies for which they are not responsible and which they have never contracted. No one speaks of these heroes, these "unknown soldiers" who are daily serving the real interests of Peace, the highest human ideal which man can conceive, an aspiration and aim such as Anarchism alone can realize.

\* \* \*

We have had quite a number of these unknown heroes in France during the last fortnight. None of the powerful leaders is extolling their virtues. On the contrary, the government and its judges are condemning them with a cruel vindictiveness unbelievable in a country like France, a country whose people are of a good-natured, lovable and libertarian spirit.

Most of the men placed before the law forum in Paris and in the province have been convicted for what they have done during the exciting weeks of last September. When it seemed that war was imminent, these men stepped forward and tried to enlighten the people by declaring that they were for "peace at any price."

Yes, that was exactly the same thing for which M. Daladier stood in Munich.

M. Daladier is lauded as the great "peace bearer." Yet, his judges condemn those who, by their actions, did more than M. Daladier has done.

At the beginning of December, the War Resisters' International (11 Abbey Rd. Enfield, Mds.) issued an admirably compiled list of war resisters imprisoned in the different countries of Europe. Unfortunately, the list is not complete as far as France is concerned. Following are the names of men who were active war resisters in the last war-crisis and who have been in prison since last September. As pointed out in their recent trials, the government is not willing to set them free. They have to spend more time in prison in addition to the months they have already suffered.

At the beginning of September, comrades Leclerc, Gaumont and Andre Scheck were arrested in Paris. Their "crime" was the publication of an article in "Libertaire." Subsequently, the article was issued as a leaflet entitled: "Workers, refuse to participate in a massacre." For the distribution of this leaflet, one of the most interesting personalities of French anarchism was arrested. He is the Arab Sail Mohamed whose long known devotion to the cause of anti-militarism is the best refutation that can be offered to those who thoughtlessly say that there are "war-loving nations." All the above named individuals were indicted for "provocation of military persons to disobedience."

In 1936 our comrade Louis Loreal was sentenced to four months' imprisonment for anti-militaristic propaganda after having been indicted for "provocation to insubordination." At that time, our fraternal contemporary, "La Patrie Humaine," instituted a protest action which obtained 150,000 signatures in favour of declaring the sentence void. The Minister of Justice at that time, Vincent Auriol, complied with this public demand. Last October, however, Loreal was arrested for his propaganda against the imminent war and has been suffering in prison for the last four months.

Meanwhile, comrades Lecoine, Faucier, Fremont, Ander, Jourdain, Duvernet, Terier, Juin and Vintrigner were all arrested for their anti-militarist activities and anti-war propaganda, oral or written. Each of the first six received prison sentences of four months. All have spent New Year's Day behind prison bars.

Then the arrest of comrades Leclerc, Fangieres and Cleret took place. They had distributed and displayed leaflets against war. For days the police had not been able to find out who went around during the night and pasted leaflets on the walls in the streets of Paris. One night our comrades were apprehended while in the midst of their work. During their trial, held in the latter part of November, they were ably defended by our comrades, Attorneys Suzanne Levy and Fourrier. Their speeches in defense of the accused were so touching that many listeners in the courtroom openly cried. But the judges were—as Shakespeare, in his immortal penetration of the human soul, said of them—"hard like stone." Leclerc was sentenced to a year in prison and a penalty of 500 francs. The penalty is based on a gold-coin value according to the Ministry of Justice. If the penalty is not paid, the prison term is lengthened. Fangieres and Cleret were each sentenced to eight months' imprisonment and a penalty of 100 Francs. A few days later, comrade Roger Coudry was sentenced to a prison term of eight months.

Most impressive was the trial of our comrade Pierre Piller. Unfortunately, his real name, Gaston Laval, was revealed to the authorities. Laval who is now 43 years of age, escaped as an anti-militarist

when the World War broke out in August, 1914. In Buenos Aires he continued his studies and received a scholarship degree in French. Several years ago, his love for France and for the anarchist movement in France brought about his return to this country. Here he has since lived as Pierre Piller; here, too, under the pseudonym of Max Stephens, he has written most brilliant articles. Through a mere accident and chiefly because of his work for the anarchist cause, he was identified by the authorities. Now, 20 years after the end of the war "to end war," Laval was tried and sentenced. Cynically and glaringly the ferocity of the judges showed itself. They sentenced him to a prison term of four and a half years—the approximate duration of the war which Laval escaped. Laval is the father of three children, the oldest of whom is not even 12 years of age. His wife is an ardent comrade.

We must remember that during the electoral campaign of 1936, Leon Blum and the "People's Front" pledged itself to declare amnesty for all World War deserters who were still being persecuted in France and for all anti-militarists who were then in prison. This promise, made by Blum before he became the leader of the government, was not fulfilled. And we do not expect the present government to decree an amnesty for war deserters and anti-militarists. We fear, therefore, that our comrade Gaston Laval will have to serve the full barbaric sentence.

The trial of comrades Duvernet and Jourdain was held during the month of December. Their "crime", too, was written and oral anti-war propaganda. For this each of them received prison terms of six months. Jourdain is the editor of the trade-union journal "Reveil Syndicaliste."

The last trials of the September anti-militarist "criminals" were held about December 15th. Comrades Lecoine and Faucier, who were accused of having written anti-war articles which were found placarded, were sentenced to prison terms of six months each and a fine of 200 Francs each. Comrades Fremont, Ander and Vintrigner, tried for distributing leaflets and articles against the impending war, each received a sentence of six months' imprisonment and a fine of 200 Francs. Our comrade Scheck, apprehended while carrying a big load of anti-war leaflets in a taxi, received a prison sentence of three months.

As this correspondence is being written, the sentences of two of our comrades, Eugene Lagot and Mohamed, are still outstanding. Lagot, a Council member of the War Resisters' International, is being held in the prison de Sante. Mohamed is in the prison of Pantoise.

The foregoing account speaks for itself. I am sure it clearly portrays what is happening to war resisters and to unflinching defenders of peace in France. May those who find themselves in happier circumstances always remember this. And may they also be stalwart when the clarion rings for them. The inspiration which has always imbued martyrdom is the foundation of all great thoughts. It is also one of the motivating forces of the anarchist movement, the one real pacifist movement in this chaos of power, violence and war.

France, January, 1939.

THE CORRESPONDENT.

I have noticed that even in friendship it is necessary to have a certain affectation which consists of that art of rendering one's self more amusing rather than an object of pity. Sadness is always monotonous for others; and we cannot have any pity that would not contain some despised irksomeness.

—CAMILO BERNERI

## Pamphlet on Graham Case Out

The long contemplated pamphlet on the persecution of MAN! and that of Marcus Graham has been published. It is entitled: "Freedom of Thought Arraigned." Every reader of MAN! and all those who have contributed to the Defense Fund will receive a copy of the pamphlet.

Frankly speaking, this pamphlet is the weapon with which we hope to stop the relentless persecutions against MAN! and Marcus Graham.

It is our hope and intention to forward copies of this pamphlet to every author, editor and educator in the country.

We urge all those who can to circulate the pamphlet at important meetings. Individuals and groups should send for as many copies as they can use. The pamphlet is not for sale; only voluntary contributions are expected as an aid in defraying printing and mailing costs.

In order that our plans for the circulation of the pamphlet should materialize, we ask all those who appreciate our labors to send financial contributions.

Freedom of Thought—and its Expression—is now more imperative than ever before. It is the chief issue in the persecution against MAN! and Marcus Graham. By aiding us in bringing about a victory in this case, you will be lending your aid to a noble cause. This country was founded on the principle of free expression. Only the vigilance of the people and the concern of all true lovers of liberty can have it remain so!

MARCUS GRAHAM FREEDOM OF THE PRESS COMMITTEE

P. O. Box 971, Los Angeles, California, U. S. A.

## Two Friends Pass Away

### Bolton Hall

With the death of Bolton Hall last December, the anarchist movement has lost a staunch friend. Unlike Henry George, his ideological teacher of the Single Tax, Hall never failed to associate himself with every activity and struggle in which our movement was engaged. No free speech fight which took place during Hall's lifetime failed to receive his moral and material support.

That Bolton Hall, who died at the age of 84, was a constant reader of MAN! is a known fact. Several of his letters appeared in our pages. One of his last acts was a contribution to the work of the Marcus Graham Freedom of the Press Committee. His only regret, he wrote, was the illness which prevented him from becoming an active member of the National Committee.

Publicly and through correspondence, Bolton Hall has expressed his admiration for our ideal. He placed it next to his Single Tax philosophy. Hall never denied that the State was necessary in order to put the Single Tax into practice. It was here that the disagreement between us began.

Bolton Hall has written not less than 17 books. The most widely read is "Three Acres and Liberty". He was a prolific contributor to the press, a speaker and the founder of the famous Single Tax colony which still exists in New Jersey.

Those in the anarchist movement who know of the untiring and unceasing labors of Bolton Hall will not fail to feel the gap which his passing away leaves with us.

### Morris Joseph

On January 6, 1939, comrade Morris Joseph died in New York City. He was well known within the anarchist circles of New York, Los Angeles and Montreal. Comrade Joseph's critical approach and seemingly constant skepticism were the distinguishing qualities by which he will be remembered. It was not that he wanted to find faults or criticize. Rather, he was a man always ready to learn and to seek the truth. He was a striking example of the strength which our ideal arouses in the minds and hearts of all seekers of Truth.

Before coming to the United States, Comrade Joseph was living in Montreal, Canada. He was then the owner of a small pants manufacturing shop. One day a new presser was hired. His name was Michael Zalichin. He was a most persuasive intelligent anarchist who died in 1929. Zalichin was the type of man who, sooner or later, attempted to acquaint anyone in his contact with the principles of anarchism. The "boss" was not excluded. Before long, the "boss"—Morris Joseph—was engaged in arguments about our philosophy. Naturally, the reading of anarchist literature followed. The result of the "boss's" acquaintance with Zalichin was, to say the least, unusual. Morris Joseph decided to close up the shop and become a worker. And from that day until his death he remained a worker. His relationship with our movement dates from that time on.

Comrade Joseph loved the land. It was natural, therefore, he should be one of the first to join the Mohegan Colony at Crompond, N. Y. However, the climate of California lured him away from the East. After spending a few years in California, he returned to the East. He made several attempts to form a colony there. His last letter to me dealt with a new attempt.

As a member of the Ferrer Branch of the Workingmen's Circle, Joseph naturally came in contact with all the activities of the Jewish Anarchist Federation. He was in contact with the "Freie Arbeiter Stimme," the organ of the Jewish Anarchist Federation. Joseph was always considered as part of the "opposition" in regard to the position taken and the work carried on by the Federation and its organ. And it was natural for him to be so. Joseph could never put up with the compromises made by both the Federation and its organ at the expense of their ideas. As a member of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union he always opposed the misdeeds of the union officials. How, then, could he have approved of the compromises made by the Federation and its organ in their relationship with the labor movement?

Nor was Comrade Joseph able to put up with the compromising position which the "Freie Arbeiter Stimme" so often takes on other social questions. Especially did he oppose, as do so many sincere Jewish-speaking comrades, the "Freie Arbeiter Stimme's" intentional disowning of the anarchist philosophy as such and its hiding under the shield of "libertarian socialism." (This will serve as an explanation to some of those comrades who have asked us why the "Freie Arbeiter Stimme" devotes columns to eulogize such slanderers of the anarchist philosophy as Kautsky and Vandervelde—with some of the eulogies written by the avowed traducer of anarchists, Max Nomad—but, at the same time, has little or no space to offer when the U. S. Government is doing its best to hand over Vincent Ferrero, accused of being an anarchist, to Italian fascism.)

Is it surprising, under such circumstances, to find that the only way through which the death of comrade Morris Joseph was made known in the "Freie Arbeiter Stimme" was an advertisement inserted by the Ferrer Branch?

Comrade Joseph was born in Rumania. He caught pneumonia and died within three days, in his early forties.

In every social movement there are striking individuals who, in all their modesty, try—as much as the present system permits—to live up to their ideal. Comrade Morris Joseph was one of these. As such he will be remembered by all those who knew him personally. And those of us who had a chance to work with him will, for a long time to come, feel saddened by the thought of his early passing away.

M. G.



# IN RETROSPECT OF CURRENT EVENTS

## Do Bandits Rule the World?

Humanity today finds itself face to face with an unprecedented situation. Fascist rulers have the effrontery of claiming to be the true expressors of the desires of their subjects. The same pretentious claim is made by the rulers of Russia's "dictatorship of the proletariat"; the same bold claim is made by democratic rulers.

It does not seem to strike any of the three brands of rulers that anyone possessing the minimum amount of plain common sense must sooner or later ask the question: How is it logically possible for these three kinds of rulership to lay claims such as they have set forth—unless these claims are merely empty, meaningless, deceitful words?

It does not seem to worry the trio of rulership that sooner or later their own subjects will realize what the more critical minds have long ago discovered; namely, that the basic methods employed by the three forms of rulership—fascist, bolshevik and democratic—are identical in every respect. Any difference that may exist lies in the vain claims made by the marxian and democratic rulers. Any "liberties" which may superficially prevail under either of the last two named rulerships can be withdrawn or abrogated, at a moment's notice, under the pretense of "national defense". Elsewhere in this issue the reader will see how France, the "motherland of liberty", applied her "democratic" governmental whip from last August to December.

\* \* \*

Much has been written about the plight of the Jews in Germany. Nearly all the so-called "democratic" rulers have openly expressed their sympathy for and desire to aid the persecuted Jews. Yet, not a single government has thus far put into practice the sympathy expressed by words of mouth. In fact, the same officials who expressed this sympathy have declared that they cannot offer asylum to the hounded Jews.

The bandits now reigning over Germany came forward with a brazen offer of blackmail whereby they expect, not only to exile every Jew in Germany, but also to have the world Jewry finance the exiling of their own brothers and lift the very effective boycott on German goods.

More amazing than the brazen audacity of the bandits of Germany is the manner in which the "democratic" rulers have reacted to this plan. Germany's Finance Minister, Hjalmar Schacht, shamelessly went to Great Britain and held secret confabs with an "international" committee of the "democracies". This was followed by having the "democracies" send an emissary for secret confabs in Germany. And our own great deck-dealer of "democracy"—President Roosevelt—has disclosed pleas he has made to Italy's mad ruler, whereby Mussolini should offer his looted Ethiopian land to the exiled Jews of Germany!

Thus, open blackmail and banditry are recognized by the rulers of "democracies" as part and parcel of governmental reign! And what assurance have the subjects of "democratic" lands that tomorrow the same sort of blackmail and banditry will not be practiced by the "democratic" rulers themselves?

Most heart rending of all in this madness is the reaction of the revolutionary movements claiming to be fighting for the Dawn of a New Society. The marxian rulers of Russia have not even had the decency to utter words of protest against the brutal treatment of the Jews in Germany, to say nothing of offering them asylum. On both scores the followers of Leon Trotsky are loudly damning the communists. At the same time, the Trotskyites and many liberals are demanding that this country open its doors to the persecuted Jews of Germany.

So bankrupt are our so-called revolutionary movements that it was left for Mahatma Gandhi, the renowned pacifist, to take the most revolutionary position on the persecution of the Jews!

"The Jews of Germany", said Gandhi, "have helped to build and develop the Germany of today. They, therefore, have as much right to continue to live in Germany as any German maniac who now holds sway there."

The position taken by Gandhi is correct; it is also revolutionary. For, if the Jews of Germany submit to exile, what assurance have they that the same thing will not happen in any other country? And, sooner or later, what disastrous effect will their submission to exile have upon the Jews of other countries?

The Jews are human beings—as much so as any other race of humans. For their good or bad qualities they can neither be praised nor condemned more than any other race. Economic conditions have effected and forged the destinies of races ever since exploitation and rulerships came into being. Therefore, to penalize any race for what an unjust economic and political order has made of them is cruel and dishonest.

Race hatred and persecutions have often been employed by rulers as a last resort for holding on to their powers. But that has never worked for long. The present wave of persecutions against the Jews will only accelerate their determination to work more fervently for those social changes which will obliterate completely and forever the two leading factors in the fostering of racial persecutions—capitalism and rulership.

\* \* \*

## On Mooney's Liberation

No human being could have remained indifferent when the voice of Tom Mooney was carried over the air on Saturday morning, January 7, 1939, the day when a pardon was granted to Mooney and the hearing in connection with it was broadcast from Sacramento, California. The tears shed by millions of listeners revealed once again how much the common people crave for justice. Those tears were not the re-

sult of a momentary sentimental outburst. Rather, they reaffirmed once more the deep-rooted conviction of the people that Thomas J. Mooney and Warren K. Billings had been buried for life because of their militancy and in order to instill fear in the minds and hearts of the American toilers. The tears shed had a manifold and widespread significance. They signified rejoicing over the fact that, at last, justice was being rendered to one of the two victims. They were a greeting to Tom Mooney—the freed man. Consciously and unconsciously, those tears must have implied a feeling of shame for our cowardice which let Mooney spend 22 years of his life behind prison bars, for our failure to employ the effective weapon of the General Strike and for the humiliating realization that the long overdue act of justice was coming through the grace of a governor—a representative of the very machinery of government which was a chief instrument in the frame-up and imprisonment of Mooney. They were tears of burning shame and impotent sorrow for the continued imprisonment of Warren K. Billings.

If anything stronger is needed to emphasize the futility of trying to obtain justice through the institution of government, it would be Governor Olson's own admission at the Mooney pardon hearing that he was unable to effectuate the liberation of Billings although Billings was framed and sentenced on identically the same charges as Mooney.

\* \* \*

Before handing Mooney his full and unconditional pardon, Governor Olson found it necessary to mention the names of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman. This occurred when the governor recalled Matt Sullivan's biased recommendation to the late Governor Rolph, a tool of predatory interests. Judge Sullivan stooped to the role of prevaricator by quoting scores and scores of articles that had appeared in "The Blast" and attributing them to Tom Mooney. Governor Olson did well to nail down Sullivan's statement as a lie, for Mooney never wrote any of the quoted articles. He was also right when he stated that it was Alexander Berkman who had written the quoted articles, but he was wrong when he added the name of Emma Goldman. Governor Olson then went on to assert that the quoted thoughts of Berkman were "chaotic." He implied that if Mooney had written them, he, too, would have turned a deaf ear to the clamors to free Mooney. It was this statement which revealed Olson as the politician. Had he wanted to be fair and sincere, he simply should have quoted from "The Blast" and let the people judge how sound and irrefutable or how "chaotic" the thoughts of our late comrade Alexander Berkman appear to be.

\* \* \*

The communists, ready to exploit any person and any cause, now claim credit for having aided in the bringing about of Mooney's liberation through their support of Governor Olson. Having become jingoists through the orders of Moscow, the communists naturally hail the freeing of Mooney as a vindication of political action and as an example of our "great democratic institutions." But among the circles of liberals and radicals—where self-meditation is not subjected to the whims and dictates of Moscow's board of censors—much doubt concerning both claims has already been evinced.

Can our boasting "democracy," maintaining a chain of legal technicalities which even the highest court in the land found impossible to surmount, be proud of having allowed the framing and 22 years of imprisonment of two human beings?

No condemnation stronger than that expressed by John J. Finerty, Mooney's attorney, need be made of the courts and their inability to render justice. Finerty said: "The Mooney case ended in the courts as it began—a disgrace to American justice and to American Courts."

The utter bankruptcy of the claim that political justice was rendered by the government is best ascertained, as we have already stated, by Governor Olson's own admission of being unable to effectuate the release of Billings as he did that of Mooney.

Also, this question arises. Was the manner in which Mooney had to legally beg for this pardon—through the insertion of legal notices in the San Francisco press—the only way in which this pardon could have and should have been brought about? Those who are in the least bit acquainted with the struggles of the workers know that this is NOT THE ONLY METHOD.

Often enough the very preparations for and the carrying on of General Strikes have brought about the freedom of such militant workers whom capitalism, through its governments, has chosen as targets. Many are the instances where the General Strike nullified governmental legislation intended to shackle the workers by depriving them of long fought for liberties. In 1920 we witnessed here in the United States how the mere threat of a General Strike forced the U. S. Supreme Court to veto anti-railroad-worker legislation. As a matter of record, too, the very lives of Mooney and Billings were saved by the revolutionary demonstrations staged before the American Embassy in Petrograd.

The blind or unthinking followers of the communists may shout "hurrahs" for political action to their hearts' content. But those who know better cannot be swayed by this. Thomas J. Mooney and Warren K. Billings could have been liberated many years ago if the workers had evinced the sort of revolutionary solidarity that was necessary. That solidarity might still be used to good advantage in bringing about the immediate liberation of Billings and of scores of other class war prisoners who are incarcerated in the dungeons of our much boasted and great "democracy."

## The Lima Conference and Wars

The outbreak of a new World War is becoming a strong possibility with each passing day. Every government in the world, no matter under what pretentious shield it may be hiding, is arming itself to the teeth.

The sell-out of Czechoslovakia at Munich has not assured the world that peace which was promised by its perpetrators. Nor will any new conference now being planned by Mr. Chamberlain—the leading actor in the betrayal of the people of the world—result in any everlasting peace.

The sell-out of Czechoslovakia at Munich has not assured the fascists at Munich can no longer be doubted by anyone. Perhaps it would be more correct to assert that revolutionary Spain was betrayed at the very moment when the infamous "non-intervention" committee was set in motion by the "democratic" governments and the Bolshevik regime of Russia. Another conference of world powers, therefore, would have only one purpose—the further shackling of the peoples of the world through exploitation and rulership.

A stirring illustration of the real purposes of so-called peace conferences has been furnished by the recent Lima Conference. As in the case of Munich, the very country chosen for the recent Pan-American Conference gives one a clear perception as to the possibilities that were in store for the interests of peace. Peru has been ruled by dictatorship ever since 1916. Benavides, the present dictator, has now no less than 7,000 political opponents behind bars. It is in this iron-ruled dictatorial country that "our great democratic" regime pretentiously set out to bring about "peace and understanding."

Of the 21 governments represented, no less than 14 are now ruled by open dictatorships.

The Lima Conference adopted 130 resolutions and declarations. What do they all mean? The "new deal" organ of the Roosevelt administration, the "NEW YORK POST", wrote in one of its editorials of December 28, 1938: "WHO WON WHAT AT THE LIMA CONFERENCE WILL BE DEBATED FOR MONTHS TO COME."

The Roosevelt Administration tried to convey the impression that the conference was to solidify the democracies of the American continent. . . . The deliberations of the conference proved how far from the truth this claim was. Even the above-mentioned editorial in the "POST" admitted that the purposes did not originate from so pure a motive. It wrote: "The United States Wants to Sell . . . but not to buy . . . This is the answer to the fallacious idea that we can go on selling more and more to other countries and buy less and less from them."

The Lima Conference, therefore, was in reality a conference dealing with the sole problem of commerce. Had the "POST" wished to be more frank, it might have equally admitted that the conference was called and held at the behest and in the sole interests of American capitalism whose desire it is to capture some of the business which the German, Italian and Japanese exploiters are now enjoying in Latin America.

Those who are still doubtful as to the true motives of the pretenses of the "new deal" administration can have their doubts removed by thinking of the unjust manner in which the U. S. government is attempting to punish and strangle the people of Mexico. Mexico has cast off the British and American oil sharks who, through bribery, acquired titles to the natural resources of Mexico. Together with the British government, the Roosevelt regime is out to force Mexico to give back to the exploiters what they never had a right to claim and to possess.

As a direct follow-up to the Lima Conference, President Roosevelt has inaugurated a chauvinistic campaign which is to whip the people of America into a patriotic frenzy. This is an accompaniment to his far reaching armament program. The C. C. C. enrolled boys are to be openly sent to militaristic schools. The radio is already filling the air with well prepared patriotic talks, plays and all sorts of militaristic propaganda. In short, the old Roosevelt of the Secretary of War days is coming out in his true colors. He is revealing himself as the true militarist he has always been. The discredited role played by Woodrow Wilson is to be enacted anew by Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

It all sounds very well to hear President Roosevelt assert, as he did on February 3, 1939, that:

"We are for the maintenance of the economic and social independence of all nations."

But he, no less than anyone else, is fully aware of the fact that NO nation in the world today can truthfully lay claim to this assertion.

At this most critical period in the world's history, we can say only this. The people of the world have entrusted their economic and political fate to the governments. In spite of all claims to the contrary, an increase in the powers of governments unfailingly results in a proportionate decrease of the well-being and happiness of every individual.

No party or individual is capable of saving the people from the immediate dangers of a new world war. The people must save themselves. Any continued homage and tribute which the people pay to any government tends to seal the ultimate doom of the people themselves.

Only when the people awaken to the realization of their own inherent strength, only when the people take revolutionary action, then only will mankind witness the inauguration of true economic and social freedom.

The choice is with the people. Without their support, exploitation and rulership are doomed to their long deserved perdition. When the people awaken and begin to act for themselves, the Dawn of a New Day will be assured.

MARCUS GRAHAM



# WHY IS WAR?

Steven T. Byington

We hear a lot about causes of war, and a good many of them can be made to seem queer by cross-examination in South America, pretty certainly fostered by the erican people detest Hitler's government in Germany and Stalin's government in Russia more than they detested King Alfonso's government in Cuba in 1898; but they went to war in 1898, and this year we have no movement in favor of war, we only have people accusing their enemies of plotting to get us into war. It may be added that Hitler and Stalin have got all the churches down on them, while the king of Spain was on good terms with at least the biggest one of the churches. Wars are made, we say, because big business wants control of a market. Well, American business today is being harder hit by German Competition in South America, pretty certainly fostered by the Nazi government for political purposes (substantially for an attack on the Monroe doctrine) than it was by Spanish misgovernment in Cuba.

The fact is that war is a peculiar activity of a unique institution called government, and there is no use trying to explain it by reasonings that keep outside the sphere of government. Government is the business of making everybody within a certain part of the world do as you say. This business may be utilized for various purposes, such as revenge, money-grubbing, or the support of a religious belief; but primarily it is sought for its own sake. There is in human nature (whether in every single person or not) an impulse to govern, just as there is an impulse to cruelty. If I wanted to bother you with psychology I might argue a theory that the impulse to government and the impulse to cruelty are not two impulses, but two forms of the same impulse. Now it is hard enough to keep down a natural impulse toward any vice when our moral training is all against it; but when all the agencies of moral training are used to foster the vicious impulse, then it just runs wild. All the agencies of systematic training that build up our habitual morality are used to aggrandize the impulse toward government, and the least you can expect is that this impulse will get mighty.

Now if you are going to obey impulse toward governing, and especially if your idealisms run toward glorifying that impulse and its works, naturally you will want to govern plenty, the more the better. No matter how plainly history teaches that mankind has developed most gloriously in small political units like Shakespeare's England, or in units that had been small so lately that the people who grew great had been born while the unit was small, as in Augustan Rome (remember that in Cicero's day Rome positively trembled before Mithridates of Pontus, and Horace wrote a most jubilant ode over the removal of such a threatening power as Cleopatra of Egypt), you will eagerly seek to extend your government over all that you can. Now there are probably at least two others who are trying to extend or maintain their government over the same subjects: a local boss of some sort (for I know as well as anybody else that the imperialists are usually quite right in saying that the independence movement is led by politicians who want to boss everything in their own interests) and a rival imperialist.

Here is at once a clash of efforts, and there must be one of three consequences: either all but one of the claimants back down, or they fight, or they settle it in some other way. Very likely you do not want to back down if you think you can win, for you think that the other fellow's claim of right is no better than yours and that his government will be no holier than yours. In forming these judgments about the other fellow you are an obviously biased judge, but that does not make it impossible that you may be right. That being so, you fight or settle it otherwise. It is said to be the tendency of civilization (and it really is the tendency, but a woefully slow tendency) to settle it otherwise. But your moral training is to the contrary: you have been taught that it is dishonorable to give up a claim to government without a fight. So war results.

And in our time war between civilized states (using that term in the sense in which such things as civilized states exist) does not come in any other way. Neither hatred nor greed for money can today make an international war unless the hatred or the greed becomes a motive for trying to shift some area from one jurisdiction (internal or foreign) to another, or to resist such a shift.

All this is obviously very pertinent to all efforts to end the reign of war. As long as this cause of war exists, all treaties of perpetual peace and balances of power and institutions of collective security are only soldering up the leaks in a boiler without a safety valve. Sometimes, no doubt, if you can stave off the break for a while the boiler will cool down. But there are bound to be other times when the prevention of leaks will simply increase the accumulation of a pressure that will end by bursting all solder; and the longer it has been kept in, the bigger will be the blow-up.

On the other hand, if you remove this one cause you have put the fire out. Obviously it would be removed by abolishing government, and pacifists would do well not to forget this. But even while government

exists there could be no war if international law were changed so that war should not have the effect of shifting jurisdiction. It would be so, for instance, if you could make jurisdiction depend on the will of some one central authority such as the Pope was in the Middle Ages. However, nothing looks much more impracticable than to make everybody agree to such a settlement in our day. But there is another possibility which is in harmony with modern tendencies, to make jurisdiction depend on the vote of the local population. If an aggressor understood that he could

## Streamlined Anarchism

There have been so many attempts to baptize the Anarchist movement with the holy waters of "respectability" that one can well understand comrade Havel's youthfully spirited invectives against the new and—in chronological order—last attempted baptism. However, Harry Kelly's retortions do not devalue the soundness of Havel's harsh but well founded arguments.

I have read the "Libertarian Socialist Manifesto" as printed in MANI. Had it not been for the name of Harry Kelly attached to it as secretary, Havel's answer and the editor's note, I could have dispensed with the document by attributing it to some people whose ideas have some points of similarity with Anarchism. In fact, if the editor had simply stated that he was publishing it out of courtesy to another splinter of the movement for social emancipation, there would have been no controversy. There are so many "Socialist Leagues" that one more or one less should not be the concern of the Anarchists.

Anarchists are free to get tired of their name and change to a streamlined one. However, those who choose to do so should have the honesty of not trying to involve the whole Anarchist movement in their transformations. In fact, the New Leaguers are taking a little too much for granted when they state that "their conclusions represent fairly accurately the Libertarians of America." Naturally, this is true if by "Libertarians" they mean the Anarchists and even if the Anarchist movement is as negligible as H. Kelly seems to think.

Harry Kelly, in his answer to Havel, speaks as an Anarchist who has streamlined himself into a Libertarian Socialist. It is because of this that I shall try to refute some of his statements.

Kelly states that by starting a co-operative in Stelton the comrades only wanted to abolish the boss. The implication that the boss can be abolished by forming a co-operative is ridiculous. To the best of my knowledge, the Stelton Co-operative gets its work from capitalist manufacturers, and it only eliminates the middleman. Hours and wages do not differ substantially from those of other shops because prices must be agreed upon by the manufacturer. There is only one way to abolish the boss, and that is to abolish the capitalist system.

What moved the Mohegan Conference to change the name was the feeling that "the spread of the ideas of freedom was vastly more important than their personalities or even a name which happens to be a hundred years old," suggests H. Kelly. What's wrong with a name being a hundred years old, anyhow? Kelly's name may be centuries old; still it does not make its bearer better or worse. And, is there anything more trite than the name "Socialist"? Or is there another name which has more splinters and modifiers than "Socialism"? Nothing could be more confusing for the workers than the name "Libertarian Socialist".

The well meaning conferees wanted to revise the methods of Anarchism and started by completely changing its name. They felt that "the trouble lies in the methods" and forthwith changed the . . . name. In this attempted revision it is lamented that "the masses have not responded to our teaching." Since when have the value and soundness of a social philosophy and its methods been judged by the number of proselytes? Or should we ape the C. P.? They have an unusual response to their "teaching", and what do they have? A mass of bleating sheep whose social and revolutionary value is nil.

It may be that "the failure of the masses to accept our ideas lies with us." Let us, then, beat our chests with due contrition and recite the "mea culpa." But let us also stop dedicating time and energy to co-operatives, trade-unions, fraternal organizations and the whole array of beclouding issues. Let us Spread Anarchism.

Never before in the history of our movement have Anarchism and Anarchists had as large a wave of admiration and approval as they have today.

This is the result of the magnificent communal exploits of our Spanish comrades.

Never before has the soundness of Anarchist methods received a better affirmation than that given by the results of the Spanish successful communal experiments. Aside from the other issues involved, this alone should suffice to prove that a change of name and a revision of methods are detrimental to the movement.

Walter BROOKS

get the land without war if he could get the good will of the population, and that successful war would give him no title unless he had that good will, he wouldn't care for the expense and risk of a war.

International law is amended by two processes: by precedent and by treaty. Every precedent that can be set in this direction, therefore, is a supremely practical step toward abolishing war. Such precedents were set by Sweden in allowing Norway to become independent without war, by Denmark and England in permitting the substantial independence of Iceland and Ireland, by the United States in permitting (even though we did make a mess of it) the independence of the Philippines, and by the treaty of Versailles in making the cession of various territories depend on local plebiscites. There was some fault found with the plebiscites, but with all their faults they have turned out better in the long run than perhaps any other part of the Versailles settlement, France, although not doubting that a plebiscite in Alsace-Lorraine would favor her, though it is undignified to take title by a plebiscite and preferred to claim the title by conquest as a more absolute and more glorious title. Today France, facing across the Rhine an enemy that she fears may be stronger than herself, might be more comfortable if instead of a title by conquest, which a subsequent conquest would completely cancel, she held a title by plebiscite, against which no future conquest could give any but a clouded title.

At any rate every example of deference to the wishes of the local population has a strong and important effect in making it easier for some other power to do the same thing next time, and has some effect toward making it difficult (though as yet it is too far from difficult) for any power to do the opposite thing; and it makes more progress toward the abolition of war than do any of the other measures that are now being taken for that purpose. My two statements that it makes more progress than the other measures and that as yet it makes little progress are not at all contradictory of each other.

As to amendment by treaty, the way would be a treaty between the United States and Canada or Mexico that any state or province on the boundary might at any time, at the request of petitioners who undertook to pay the expense of the election, hold a plebiscite for transfer to the other sovereignty, that an affirmative result should take effect if the other power consented to receive the cession, and that a negative result should close the question for twenty years. Even such a treaty between two powers that could never have occasion to apply it, such as Switzerland and Paraguay, would have a tremendous effect on the world's point of view. Nobody with power or influence has yet ventured to propose such a thing; but there might at any time be a statesman with genius enough to raise the question; and once raised, it would not down.

An obstacle to any effective measure of precaution against war is the difficulty of giving practical effect to a refusal to recognize an illegitimate title. The origin of the World War was that Austria, which was administering Bosnia on a basis something like what we now call a mandate, became afraid that Turkey would get strong enough to recover possession, and suddenly announced that she had annexed Bosnia to her own territories. The other great powers which had authorized Austria to administer Bosnia objected that they could not recognize this annexation as lawful and valid. Austria said she was very sorry; if they had spoken sooner she might have given consideration to what they said; but they spoke too late, the country was already annexed before they made their objection, and now that it was already a part of Austria it was not within the rights of the other powers to say anything about it. The other powers made up faces, but decided that they could do nothing in the case, and so Bosnia remained subject to Austria; and out of this, everybody knows, came the World War.

The World War did not turn out better for the Emperor of Austria than for the other potentates who went into it, but nevertheless Austria's example has been followed. Japan occupied Manchuria and set up a puppet government there with little respect for international law; it is no treason for me to say this, for a special commission of the League of Nations formally reported that the whole business was illegal and invalid and the new government could not be recognized. Japan answered the commission's report as Austria had answered the protesting ambassadors before. More recently the same thing has been done in Ethiopia, except that fewer formal documents have been issued.

We have made this much progress, that we do not now admit the validity of the results so soon as was done in the Bosnia case. Most governments do not yet acknowledge either Manchukuo or the Italian annexation of Ethiopia. But we haven't yet found out just what to do. If we don't accredit any consul to Harbin as under the sovereignty of Manchukuo, and a counsel accredited to Harbin as under the sovereignty of China is not admitted there, the result is that Japan gets the monopoly of the Manchurian trade, and that is just what most delights Japan. The times call for

(Continued on Page Six)







# ART and LITERATURE

## A Vagabond Speaks His Mind

(Monologic Dialogue)

How's a chance fo' a cuppa coffee, mister?  
Waita-minute, don't gimme the bum's rush 'fore you hears what a guy has to explain.

That's fine. That's givin' a guy a break. Le's go to Ole Pete's; a swell joint, makes yuh feel sorta bein' in yer own home.

Looka here, mister, if I ain't too inquisitive you don't act 'tall like an average human bein'. Maybe yuh're a scribe or somethin'—you know, them guys what print in the papers fo' fears nobody'll wanna list'n to their conversation.

Aw, I sees; you're one of them communists; well, it don't matter moch, yer mumblyin's won't change my ideas 'tall. 'May's well be frank with you, I have's been listenin' to all yer stump-speechin' there's 'round Union Square an' it ain't never changed my way of thinkin'. —Kin I git a hamburger, mister?

Moch obliged. It sure tastes swell when a stomach gits jittery like he's never seen a hamburger in his life.

What's that you say, why am I hungry? Gee whiz, I thought you socialists is smart people. Well, I's gonna give yuh some 'petty intelligent info'mation. Lis'en to this brother an' git wise: I's hungry 'cause I ain't got no dough to buy meeself a grub, git me?

Now we're comin' to somethin'. Yuh really wanna know why I don't git meeself a job or go fo' some of that char'ty dough. Well, git this and git it straight: I'm what yuh call a revolutionists—a red! d'yuh unde'stand? An' don't go braggin' 'bout yer propaganda stuff either, fo' it ain't affectin' me none 'tall. Im jest a natural born revolutionists, that's what I am.

Here ya go agin with yar highbrow dissertation 'bout social reconstruction 'n' all that. I tell you it don't mean a damn thing to nobody. It all works out the same way; jest like a merry-go-round—comes back from whe'e it started.

Have I heard 'bout higher wages, 'n' sho'ter hours 'n' all them refo'ms? List'n mister, if you kin go fool-in' them capitalist you should have yer pictu'e taken twice every day. D'you really supposin' them big Co'porations 'll give you a boost in wages as a donation? Nothin' doin'. They haven't gone cookoo yet. 'Fact is the more percentages they raise on them wages more capitalists they gits to be. Read yar statistics an' see how many millionere sprung up since that thar New Deal came functionin'.

Sure I'm a radical. Shucks, I'm as good a radical as anybody, but the ideas I gits in me head ain't comin' from none of yar hifelutin theories which don't mean nothin'. I jest keeps my eyes open to all what's goin' on an' that's how I works meeself up a philosophy 'bout this 'all damn social order.

Darn right I've read yuhr philosophy 'bout the social revolution, but yuh ain't gonna preach me one philosophy an' then go practicin' another. I'm jest sick an' tired listenin' to yuhr ideas fo' a proletarian socialism and then yuh go campaignin' fo' a capitalist gove'nment.

How I came to grab me such an idea! That's a nifty one. Does a guy hafta be intellectual an' wear them spectacles to git some ideas in his noodle? Not me brother. I ain't had mooch of an education but I sure kin sees what's wrong with this whole damn business.

Who, me afraid to explain what's done me to turn against the communists? Say, I kin send the whole cookeyed world to the dumps without even lookin' 'round. But a guy kin't go on talkin' with jest one hamburger floatin in his belly, kin he?—How's about another hamburger, mister?

That's great! Gee they taste swell, ' must be makin' 'em from 'ristocrat dogs.

Well, I guess 'll hafta loosen up a bit an' explain how it's done me to break away from all your socialists. You see, I goes one day to one of your communist meetings—a sort of comradely entertainment with beer, hot-dogs 'n' all. I looks around an' what do you supposin' I sees? All yous guys that's preechin' the social revolution have buttons pinned on their coats which read: VOTE STRAIGHT DEMOCRATIC, an' all of 'em praisin high up to the ceilin' Pres. Roosevelt, Gove'nor Lehman an' the rest of them big-shots that cater to the capitalist order of society. If that ain't betrayin' yer own principals then I must be a monkey's pup.

I jest was expectin' it comin' from you. I jest knew yuh're gonna bring in that New Deal agin. It's no use, mister. The Ups'll be Ups an' the Downs'll be Downs in any capitalist deal. You thinks by raisin' a few percentages on me wages I'll git on equal footin' with them rich, send me wife to the Mount'ns an' me chillen to the colleges 'n' dansan-err-dancin' academies? A lotta baloney, that's what it is. Seems every time I gits a few extra pennies in me pay-envelope I has to hand it right back fo' them groceries, an' 'rents an' everythin' us folks needs to keep on goin'.

Quit yer kiddin', will ya. I kin't help wunner'erin' how all yuh guys with socialist ideas fall fo' that ref'm stuff. Yuh're gona tell me 'bout that Social Security,

ain't you? Megosh, I wouldn't give you two whoops fo' all them Security Benefits. I tell yuh, the people must be crazy with the heat; all they's life they sweat in hard labor fo' providin' them big profiteers with a lot of comfort an' luxury an' then they gits tickled skinny 'cause them capitalist provide 'em with a pauper's pension when they gits to be 65 years of age an' have no mo'e teeth fo' chewin' or stomach fo' digestin'. Ain't this a psychiatrin' world we're living in?

Holy smokes! Yuh come boastin' now bout that unemployment insurance. Ain't the somethin' wunn'erful! Say, that system of providin' grub fo' the hungry an' disconted is nothin' extraordinary. It's been done a lotta times befo'e so's to shut their mouths up. Fo' one thing the capitalists hafta keep 'em from grumblyin' so's they kin be surer with their big investments; an' discontented is nothin' extraordinary. It's been done whole economic system from goin' to the rocks. 'member the depression years? Folks then couldn't pay the rents, an' the interest, an' all them bond papers didn't

## On The Block

Today, ladies and gentlemen, we present another dramatic scene entitled "By Thy Sweat You Shall Eat." Curtain. (A neatly-dressed gent stands at the bar, one foot resting on the rail and sipping sparingly from a whiskey glass, he starts a friendly chat with the bartender.)

GENT: You don't seem too busy today.

GUSS (the bartender): Gosh it's been slow today. I ain't sold more than a half-dozen drinks the whole afternoon.

GENT: You know what's causing it, don't you?

GUSS: Well, I'm not one of them Big-Shots, but I suppose it's because a lot of people ain't working much.

GENT: They ain't working, eh? Why, them lazy son's babit's ought to starve. You think if you gave 'em a job they'd work? Don't kid yourself? Them bums never worked in their life and never will.—C'mon, pour it in.

GUSS: That's a mighty fine roll you got there. Gosh you must have sweated hard to get so much dough.

GENT: You bet I did. I was sweatin' blood befo'e I saw my favorite horse come in . . .

\*\*\*\*

Why doesn't Mr. Dies recommend to deport the Indians that are still living in his country; doesn't he know they are Reds? . . .

\*\*\*\*

Those Nazi Siegfrieds are certainly a brave lot; they can lick anybody from 8 years up . . .

\*\*\*\*

Will somebody inform Father Coughlin (referring to his radio address of Nov. 27) that those innocent women and children in Spain are being slaughtered by the Legions of the Cross?

\*\*\*\*

And another thing, where did the Father get the notion that Jews have no right to be atheists, in his "Social Justice"? . . .

\*\*\*\*

So Germany and Japan reached a cultural accord for their peoples, eh? We only hope the Japanese and Germans will now get a taste of the Kultur the Chinese and Spaniards have been getting from them . . .

\*\*\*\*

My, My, what a halliballoo the looting of Jewish property on Berlin streets was raised in the capitalist press. You'd think they's shed a lot of tears if those Nazi henchmen would murder the Jewish population?

\*\*\*\*

If Mr. Chamberlain should get a dose of Mussolini's castor oil he'd be running so fast he wouldn't have to fly any more . . .

\*\*\*\*

It seems Hitler can get almost anything but the German measless . . .

\*\*\*\*

Jews must think an awful lot of those Nazis if they can pay \$400,000,000 for a dead one . . .

\*\*\*\*

And while we mentioned this, our Santa confided to us that if he were a German jew he'd laugh in Hitler's face if he's come to collect from him the fine; he couldn't do more than persecute him anyway . . .

\*\*\*\*

When the news reached our department that in the 13 month-old "incident" the Japs have killed one million Chinese, our expert mathematician immediately reached for pencil and paper and figured out that at such rate it will take 600 years for Japan to conquer China.

But just to show you how figures can lie, we purposefully omitted the new Chinese that might be born in 600 years.

\*\*\*\*

Regarding the Coster-Musica swindle of \$18,000,000 we can't seem to figure out the following problem that's been puzzling us ever since:

1. Where did the money go to?

2. If he hadn't manipulated this money, who would have gotten it? . . .

(Anybody solving it for us will be awarded a Hitler medal . . .)

\*\*\*\*

Well, anyway, at least Russia is now safe. France has agreed to protect her in the event of a Hitler invasion . . .

Santa PANTA

as mooch of it fo' a decent rectum, 'member that? Why, even the municipal gove'nments didn't have 'nough dough to keep them krap-shooters on the pay-roll. So you sees, they had to do somethin' fo' savin' all them there securities from ruination, didn't they? That's why they's had to think up somekind of a scheme to satisfy the down an'-outers with a couple of weeks pay so's to keep them paper securities from goin' to the dogs. Ain't that a crazy system we're havin'?

Jumpin' Jesus! You come boastin' about that "relief" business? Say, kin yuh imagine anything more insultin' fo' human bein's than be livin' on charity? Strike me down with a lamp-post if I kin unde'stand your way of thinkin'. Here you go preechin' 'bout social an' economic equality fo' the workin' class an' then you turn 'round stump-speechin' fo' a gove'nment that lets a lot of speculato's an' good-fo'-nothin' parasites livin' like them fancy dukes 'cause some poor families gits a charity dole to keep 'em from starvin'.

Don't hand me that stuff, will ya! You wanna keep the liberal administration so's the damn Fascists would stay the hell out. Well, mister, that's boilin' me up no end. You're really supposin' you kin depend on one man with a whole social philosophy? A lotta hooee that's what it is, 'member what happened with yer socialists — them thar MacDonalds and Muzzolinis? Shucks, look at yuhr socialist, that Mosseure Daladier. You sees what he's doin' now? He's gonna destroy all them refo'ms the French workers got by goin' out on strike an' make 'em slaves to a Nazi regime which he's introduc'in'. That's jest what yuh kin expect from them liberal guys. Brother, you kin't baloney us thinkin' people any longer. You socialists always sold out the workin' class so's yuh kin git yerself nice political jobs with the capitalist gove'nments.

What's the matter mister, I wasn't mooch intrudin' was I? Well if You're in a hurry it's okay by me. S'long then, when we meet 'n heaven I'm gonna treat yuh to the juciest pair of hamburger ya ever laid yer eyes on.

Who, me 'n hell? Gee vinekars, us folks never gits the breaks . . .

Samuel Polinow

\*\*\*

## EAGLE AND SWASTIKA

Build your 75-foot highways  
for the divertment of the big guns,  
the brazen laughing wide-mouthed guns:

and double-track your railroads  
that the black winking engines  
may carry them back from the frontiers

Twice-broken, twice-rebellious,  
asking the road to Berlin.

Llewellyn Ap-RHYNS

\*\*\*

## LIFE: PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE

1

I tasted dying roses on the floor  
They were life's breath—the endless breath—  
The living breath of death in the setting west  
And the eternal moisture in the east—life,  
Comingled wih fire and water.

2

We purified our minds in a snow white flame,  
We pushed ourselves in darkness—  
We drank bitter brew;  
But who rose out in the end—  
In answer, the sign of me and you?

3

When, in the dim distance of the past,  
We spoke of things to be,  
How many times were we right? \*  
How much did we forget to foresee?  
When we come back to harbor—  
Out of the greeny sea—  
What will be in store for you and me?

David TOBIN

\*\*\*

## TOWERS

The Empire State building towers high  
over the jungle of Manhattan where  
Neanderthals of the twentieth century  
dig themselves caves in the stone walls  
of skyscrapers . . .

Once the walls of Babylon towered high . . .  
the pride of a gaudy emperor . . . today  
a torrid sun bakes the flats where once  
those towers stood and jackels bark at  
twilight among the ruins of the once  
mighty city.

Chapel once was mighty . . . today, even as  
the guns still roar . . . rats crawl among  
its smouldering ruins.

William Allen WARD



# JUDGE LEON R. YANKWICH and FREEDOM of THOUGHT

(Since the Ninth Federal Circuit Court of Appeals has already for a second time remanded the case of Marcus Graham back to Judge Leon R. Yankwich (see editorial on column three) the exchange of letters between the Marcus Graham Freedom of the Press Committee and Judge Yankwich should prove of special interest, as will also the letter of Robert Whitaker.—EDITOR).

## A LETTER TO JUDGE YANKWICH

Judge Leon R. Yankwich, U. S. District Court.

Dear Sir:

At the request of Mr. C. N. Bennett we are forwarding you a copy of their protest directed to you.

You may be interested to learn that the most influential Democratic daily newspaper in the United States, the St. Louis "Post-Dispatch", has taken up the case of Marcus Graham. In its issue of April 20, 1938, appears a detailed and lengthy account of the whole case in which your arbitrary role in the case is fully exposed.

"Unity"—the magazine edited by John Haynes Holmes, carries an expose of the case in its issue of April 30.

"The Truth Seeker" of New York City carries a stinging rebuke at your decision by that veteran great fighter for Freedom—George E. MacDonald.

Thus you can see—that the real liberty loving men and women of America are slowly but surely becoming aware of your reactionary role in this case where you had every opportunity to uphold the inalienable concepts upon which this country has been founded: Freedom of Thought and the Freedom of the Press.

Perhaps it is not yet too late for you to rectify a wrong. All you need but do is to examine the records of the transcripts on hearings given to Graham since October, 1937. Therein you will find open admissions of Inspector Henderson (Transcript-page 3), Inspector Press (Transcript page-8), District Inspector Del Guercia (Transcript page-24), and by Inspector in Charge Mr. Shaw (Transcript page-30),—all these open admissions prove that the only purpose of the arrest of Graham, and of all subsequent hearings given to him were to obtain information that would aid the Labor Department in carrying out the very deportation Warrant of 1919—that you repeatedly stated from the bench that you will not give any aid in enforcing! Even the order by the San Francisco Labor Department requesting a re-opening of the case admits the same purpose. (Exhibit F.)

This evidence proves that the U. S. District Attorney, Mr. Eardley, lied in open Court when he stated that the Labor Department was not trying to enforce the deportation order of 19 years standing.

We understand that the case is still under your jurisdiction. If so, why not do the just thing—by calling back the case and placing the proof of duplicity at the door of the local immigration department as well as the U. S. Federal attorney—and purging Graham of the contempt sentence?

We understand that it is a most difficult suggestion that we are making. But it is human to err, even for a judge.

Your failure to rectify a great wrong will only arouse us to continue our campaign of bringing the case of Marcus Graham before the thinking world here as well as abroad.

That the persecution of Graham is solely for his exercising the right of Freedom of Thought and of its Expression is fully borne out not only by the open admission of Mr. Eardley, U. S. District Attorney, but also by the District Director of the San Francisco Labor Department (see Exhibit F. Paragraph 3).

In writing this letter we are not appealing for justice. We are asking for it, and asking it of a judge who wishes to be known as a liberal judge, and not as one who is determined to outrank every reactionary Federal Judge in the country.

Respectfully yours,  
MARCUS GRAHAM FREEDOM  
OF THE PRESS COMMITTEE

\* \* \*

## JUDGE YANKWICH'S REPLY

May 14, 1938.

Marcus Graham Freedom of the Press Committee  
Gentlemen:

I have your letter of May 11th containing the letter of protest signed by C. N. Bennett.

I enclose copy of letter addressed to Mr. Bennett today.

As the matter is no longer before me, but pending before the Circuit Court of Appeals, you will please me by not writing to me or sending me any of your literature. I know the propaganda you have been carrying on all over the United States and I know from Mr. Lewis Browne the misrepresentations by which you have obtained some of the signatures to your protest. And I simply am not interested by your protests of friendship and appeals to me. Whether you consider me a liberal or illeberal judge is simply immaterial to me.

Yours very truly,

LEON R. YANKWICH  
U. S. District Judge

## Our Reply

June 28, 1938.

Judge Leon R. Yankwich, U. S. District Court.

Dear Sir:—

A reply to your letter of May 14th was held in abeyance in order to see if Mr. Lewis Browne will resign from our Committee since you wrote that "I know from Mr. Lewis Browne the misrepresentations by which you have obtained some of the signatures to your protest."

Up to this very day—Mr. Browne has not resigned from our Committee, nor has any other single member. As you will soon enough learn, many more notable men of letters have joined the Committee.

We therefore challenge you to prove as truthful your assertion that we have obtained a single member on our Committee by misrepresentation.

Likewise we emphatically deny as a falsehood your assertion that we have appealed to you for a reconsideration of the case of Marcus Graham. In fact we wrote to you:

"... we are not appealing for justice. We are asking for it..."

Your statement that you are not interested whether you are considered as a liberal or illeberal judge is fully betrayed by the stereotyped letters with which you are asking all those publications (that denounced your reactionary and unlawful decision) to print as a defense. Such veteran fighters for freedom, not vain pretenders as yourself,—like George E. MacDonald of the Truth Seeker and Robert Whitaker writing to Unity—are exposing your decision for all that it is unworthy of. But if you think this is all that you will be receiving from your misact of justice, you will in the near future realize the mistake. Our campaign of exposure—of the action of the Labor Department to persecute a man for 19 years and the support that you lent to this persecution—has just begun.

Your request not to have us send any more literature will be complied with. There is no one more blind than one who refuses to see. It is your privilege to openly join this class of people. It is our right to make this fact known to those who have until recently considered you an open-minded liberal man.

MARCUS GRAHAM FREEDOM  
OF THE PRESS COMMITTEE

\* \* \*

## Robert Whitaker to Judge Yankwich

Judge Leon R. Yankwich, U. S. District Court,

My Dear Judge Yankwich:—

Just now I have read with interest your letter as published in UNITY, of Chicago, as I read with particular care your statements of greater length set forth earlier in the Open Forum of Los Angeles. I have long admired you, as a man, and held you in especial regard as one who seemed to me to transcend the ordinary judicial attitude in recognizing with unusual clarity the supremacy of common sense and social movement over the literalisms of the Courts, and legal technicians.

I confess that with all my desire to continue this high regard for you, and with no present disparagement in my mind of your sincerity and exceptional personality in general, your reasoning has left me wholly unsatisfied with your self-defense, or shall I say your defense of the legal procedure to which you have given the endorsement of your character and position.

In this connection let me say that I am far from agreeing with Marcus Graham, in his political philosophy, that I am no anarchist. But I have followed his work also for many years, with some slight personal acquaintance, and more intimate acquaintance with his high principles and rare sacrificial service on behalf of the fundamental rights of man, a consideration which I am compelled to say seems to me vastly greater than the consideration for human rights so habitually overridden by the Courts. From the viewpoint of that increase in respect for the great humanities which must inevitably overthrow all the degenerate worship of literalisms both in the field of religion and in the field of legalism which has brought the world to its present horrible plight, Marcus Graham is in my opinion head and shoulders above the Courts, as he is, in general, also in advance of the churches.

You are, I feel, arguing with yourself in your attempt to justify the procedures to which your legal position has brought you, far beyond your consciousness of this fact. Loyalty has for the moment become a virtue defeating a greater loyalty, and your reasoning an intellectual mirage in which you have lost sight of the everlasting hills. Both you, and the law, are the greater sufferers by this lesser loyalty which has lost for you the immediate vision of a loyalty which transcends words, and without which vision all words become a delusion and a snare. The loss to you counts less with me, much as I have esteemed you and I think would count less with you yourself, if admitted, than the loss to the law, which is already in sad estate with the people, and runs deeper and deeper into the bog of public contempt, or at least, public regret and alarm.

You are on the wrong road, friend, even in serving the law; there is tragedy, fearful tragedy ahead if the Courts cannot understand the mighty undercurrents of our day which drive toward the substance of human rights against all the sophistries of that letter—wor-

## Our "Liberal" Labor Department

Through their stooges in Congress, the red baiters of our benighted "land of the free and home of the brave" are—at the behest of the business interests—attempting to brow-beat Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins, Commissioner of Immigration Houghteling and U. S. Solicitor Reilly into effecting the deportation of Harry Bridges, held responsible for the strength of the labor movement on the Pacific Coast.

Let anyone should think that the three above-mentioned officials responsible for the policy of the Department of Labor are really liberal in the interpretation and application of the infamous deportation laws which stand today as a vilification of every American tradition, we suggest a cursory review of the activities of the Department against the labor struggle and the exercise of the right of free thought. The Department of labor has fallen within the confines of comicalness in its attempt to deport John Strachey, an English Lord who has espoused the marxian philosophy, and in the instituting of deportation proceedings (at present held in abeyance pending a court decision) against Harry Bridges, a labor politician of leftist leanings but, nevertheless, an avowed upholder of the New Deal, the government and the Constitution.

We shall limit ourselves to pointing out two cases which are typical of the Department's wrongdoings and which have received more publicity in the press. The case of Vincent Ferrero demonstrates the cynical attitude of government officials in dealing with the life of the people. Ferrero, whose life will be in grave danger should he be deported to fascist Italy, has not been able to secure a visa for any other country and, in a letter to the Secretary, (copy of which was published in the last issue of MANI), has signified his willingness to leave the country under protest—since he upholds and defends his right to live as a free citizen in this country where he has resided for 33 years—when he will be able to do so without endangering his life. Yet, the liberal New Dealers of our Department of Labor refuse to give Ferrero a stay, threaten the confiscation of the bond and have voiced their determination to deport Ferrero to his doom in Italy at their first opportunity.

The readers of MANI, are familiar with the persecution of the editor of this journal, Marcus Graham. It is already known that the Ninth Federal Circuit Court of Appeals has reversed the six month sentence imposed by the "liberal" Judge Leon R. Yankwich upon Marcus Graham for the latter's refusal to testify against himself in deportation proceedings. The reversal of the sentence was made upon the court's ruling that a defendant has the right to refuse to testify against himself in criminal as well as in civil procedure. In the remaining of the issues involved, the Court of Appeals sustained Judge Yankwich in his condoning of the unlawful acts perpetrated by the Department against Graham and this journal and remanded the case to Judge Yankwich to determine which questions would not be self-incriminating and, therefore, answerable by court's compulsion.

The "liberal" characteristics of the New Dealers in the Department of Labor were shown when its officials hastened to appeal to the Circuit Court of Appeals for a re-hearing. The reversal was rendered toward the end of October, and in November the Department had already presented its expensively printed appeal. On January 16, 1939, the Circuit Court of Appeals denied the appeal and gave the Department 5 days within which to execute the outstanding decision with the alternative of appealing to the U. S. Supreme Court. The Department's representatives immediately asked for a 30 day stay of execution which was granted by the Court on January 20, 1939. This shows their determination to force Graham to serve the sentence unjustly imposed by the lower court.

Graham is under a \$1000 bond of the Department of Labor. This fact notwithstanding, Judge Yankwich exacted another court bond of \$1000 which he now refuses to release with a promise of reducing the bond to \$500.

The "liberalism" of the Roosevelt Department of Labor stands condemned on the face of its own activities. As most of the Washington correspondents have pointed out, the threatened impeachment of the officials of the Department of Labor is nothing more than a blackmailing attempt on the part of the notorious Dies Committee to get a new lease on life. The attempted impeachment was used as a club to compel the administration and its supporters to approve an appropriation of \$100,000 to satisfy the reactionary desires and ambitions of the burly congressmen from Texas who is practicing the crude methods of horse trading in the Congress of the United States.

ship which wrecks every institution that exalts the letter above the spirit of justice and human right.

Yours, with sincere regards,

ROBERT WHITAKER